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Using *Pyett* to Counter the Fall of Contract-based Unionism in a Global Economy

Stephen A. Plasst†

Structural changes in the economy that contributed to high unemployment have combined with global wage competition to destroy the contract-making and contract-enforcement powers of unions. Supporters of labor uniformly insist on defining the role of unions as contractual, and condemn the Supreme Court’s Pyett decision that permits unions to take control of their members’ legal claims. Yet unions’ contractual powers have dwindled under the National Labor Relations Act, thereby leaving workers vulnerable to the bargaining demands of their employers. This article shows how Pyett can renew the importance of unions.

The Article argues that read appropriately, Pyett is positively transformative in the same way as the Steelworkers Trilogy. Although the Pyett decision did not offer a compelling justification for its conclusion that unions are authorized to bargain about antidiscrimination rights, unions’ effective advocacy for their members’ antidiscrimination claims may be a practical necessity today. The Article focuses on Pyett’s potential to transform the workplace by eliminating the line between contract and legal disputes. Using the Trilogy as a backdrop, and antidiscrimination rights as an example, the article addresses the theoretical and practical concerns cited as obstacles to Pyett’s viability. It provides original answers to the questions Pyett left open and provides a roadmap on how the decision may be implemented contractually to advance employers’ and workers’ interests.
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INTRODUCTION

In 1960, the Supreme Court declared in the Steelworkers Trilogy that arbitrators are better qualified than judges to interpret and apply collective bargaining contracts. The Court announced that labor contracts reflected a system of self-government that incorporated implied norms and industry practices that are foreign to the competence of judges. Because arbitrators have a unique understanding of the parties’ private regulatory regime, according to the Court, their authority and decision making should be given great deference. This principle of deference to the arbitrator and the arbitral award, even in situations where the arbitrator exceeded his authority, would purportedly promote the national policy of peaceful settlement of labor disputes.

The Trilogy’s sweeping endorsement of the arbitral forum for the resolution of contract disputes was alarming to labor relations professionals. Employers were particularly bewildered by the notion that a
labor contract was broader than its express terms, and that employees may have rights greater than those consciously ceded by management during contract negotiations. The Court's broad restriction on judicial involvement in reviewing the arbitrator's work seemed irrational, and companies scrambled to reconfigure contracts to rein in arbitral prerogative. But this initial consternation proved misplaced, and today few question the success of the Trilogy.

Almost fifty years after the Trilogy, the Court decided to launch a second revolution in collective bargaining. In 14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett, the Court ruled that unions and employers may contract away employees' statutory right to bring their antidiscrimination claims before a judicial forum, forcing employees to resolve their statutory claims before arbitrators exclusively. This decision is revolutionary because it endorses arbitration, a process designed to deal with contract disputes that implicate group interests, for the resolution of personal statutory claims that may conflict with the interests of the collective. The Pyett decision also seems to be decried by practitioners and occasionally regretted by arbitrators); Bernard D. Meltzer, The Supreme Court, Arbitrability and Collective Bargaining, 28 U. Chi. L. Rev. 464, 473 (1961) (noting the irony of the Trilogy's conclusion that judges were "dwarfs" and arbitrators were "giants" when dealing with labor agreements, in light of the Court's Lincoln Mills holding that judges were qualified to make new laws to govern labor agreements); Russell A. Smith & Dallas L. Jones, The Impact of the Emerging Federal Law of Grievance Arbitration on Judges, Arbitrators, and Parties, 52 Va. L. Rev. 831, 888-89 (1966) (noting that there was general apprehension about the effects of the Steelworkers Trilogy).

See Smith & Jones, supra note 5, at 888-89.

See Jerome S. Rubenstein, Some Thoughts on Labor Arbitration, 41 Marq. L. Rev. 695, 696 (1966) (observing that the Trilogy permits arbitrators to play King Solomon on the premise "that in some way labor arbitration transcends the mere resolution of contractual disputes").

See id. at 269-71 (holding that "[i]t was Congress' verdict that the benefits of organized labor outweigh the sacrifice of individual liberty that this system necessarily demands"); J.I. Case Co. v. NLRB, 321 U.S. 332 (1944) (holding that individualized contracts are trumped by the interests of the collective once a union is chosen as the employees' bargaining representative); see also Emporium Capwell Co. v. W. Addition Cmtv. Org., 420 U.S. 50 (1975) (holding that principles of majority rule take precedence over the individual claims of employees). This priority of group interests in the collective bargaining process has been one of the unwavering principles of the NLRA. See Adams v. Entercom Kansas City, LLC, No. 08-2643-JWL, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 101400, at *48 (D. Kan. Oct. 30, 2009) (holding, inter alia, that individual rights are "inextricably intertwined" with—and trumped by—the collective contract); Lagrotte v. AMR Corp., No. 3:97-CV-1278-P, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3439, at *11-13 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 12, 1998) (recognizing that when individual contracts conflict with the collective bargaining agreement, the collective agreement will prevail); O'Neil v. Epic Power Servs., Inc., 620 F. Supp. 32, 35-36 (S.D. Ga. 1985) (holding that the national policy of collective bargaining supersedes individual contracts when the two conflict).

Title VII, for example, protects each "individual" from discrimination by employers, employment agencies, and unions. See 42 U.S.C. § 2000e (2012). This individualized protection extends even to facially neutral practices that do not produce discriminatory results. See Connecticut v. Teal, 457 U.S. 440, 452-55 (1982) (holding that even if an exam used to decide promotions did not have an overall discriminatory racial impact, it was nonetheless illegal if it arbitrarily prevented individual black employees from being promoted).
irrational and unworkable because labor arbitrators historically did not interpret and apply statutory law, unions have the legal right to sacrifice individual rights in pursuit of collective interests, and the jurisprudence supporting arbitral resolution does not trump an employee’s express statutory right to the judicial forum.

Although all the angles have not yet been worked out, the Pyett Court assured us that arbitrators are qualified to decide statutory claims; that employees will lose no substantive right in the arbitral forum; that Congress placed several checks in the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and antidiscrimination law on unions sacrificing individual rights to promote group interests; and that the duty of fair representation will ensure union accountability for processing statutory claims. Because these declarations are remarkable and unprecedented, this article will explore their bona fides. This article will assess whether the Court got it right, as it did in the Trilogy, and whether workers therefore need not feel threatened by the prospect of union control of their antidiscrimination rights.

This article argues that the Pyett decision can positively revolutionize workplace dispute resolution in the same way the Steelworkers Trilogy did. It argues that unions and employees should embrace the Pyett

12. See United Steelworkers v. Enterprise Wheel & Car Corp., 363 U.S. 593 (1960). The Court noted: [A]n arbitrator is confined to interpretation and application of the collective bargaining agreement; he does not sit to dispense his own brand of industrial justice. He may of course look for guidance from many sources, yet his award is legitimate only so long as it draws its essence from the collective bargaining agreement. When the arbitrator’s words manifest an infidelity to this obligation, courts have no choice but to refuse enforcement of the award.

Id. at 597.

13. See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 255-57 (holding that unions have broad discretion when contracting with employers, and can trade an employee’s statutory forum rights for some group benefit the union desires).

14. Unlike the Trilogy’s premise that arbitration promotes labor peace and is the substitute for industrial strife, Warrior & Gulf, 363 U.S. at 578-82, the Pyett decision cites no national antidiscrimination policy that will be advanced by arbitral resolution of such disputes. Instead, the Court inferred authority for forum waivers because Congress did not expressly prohibit them, and summarily concluded that the remedial and deterrent functions of antidiscrimination law will not be undermined by a switch to arbitration. See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 258; see also Gilmer v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp., 500 U.S. 20, 26-33 (1991).

15. See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 268-69 (stressing that the old mistrust and suspicions about the competency of arbitrators is misplaced and has long been rejected).

16. See id. at 265-66 (holding that a forum change can be effectuated without contravening any federal substantive guarantees).

17. See id. at 271-72.

18. See id. (concluding that the duty of fair representation imposed on unions is a sufficient deterrent to union mishandling of statutory grievances).

19. See United Steelworkers v. Am. Mfg. Co., 363 U.S. 564 (1960) (holding that the national policy in favor of arbitration would be undermined if courts were allowed to determine the merits of grievances when an arbitration clause arguably covered the dispute); United Steelworkers v. Warrior &
decision and push it to its interpretive extremes. If this is done, unions, their members, and employers can all benefit, and a new revolution in unionism and labor arbitration can occur. Theoretically, Pyett can be made a raison d'etre for unions. Yet its practical success depends on the degree to which unions and their members recognize that a united front on workplace civil rights provides a basis for proving that unions have continuing relevance in the private-sector workplace.

To show the potential of Pyett, the article will first detail the rules of forum waiver as announced by the Court. Part I will start by exploring the Court's employment arbitration doctrine based on the Gilmer decision. Then, Part I will argue that the Court did not weave employment discrimination claims into the existing framework of traditional labor arbitration. Instead of adopting the existing contract-based system of labor arbitration, the Court expanded the contract-based rules to accommodate statutory discrimination claims.20

The second Part of the article demonstrates that Pyett's expansion of labor arbitration rules to include statutory claims need not produce doomsday results for discrimination victims. In fact, the decision has the potential to do the opposite. This Part addresses the dilemma unions face now that forum waivers are subjects of mandatory bargaining, the historic tension between unions and discrimination victims,21 the tension between individual rights and collective interest, the suitability of the arbitral forum for the resolution of discrimination claims, and the perceived demand on union resources. Despite these difficulties, Part II argues that national

Gulf Nav. Co., 363 U.S. 574 (1960) (holding that unless the parties specifically exclude certain matters from arbitration, courts must defer to the special competence of arbitrators to interpret and apply the parties' unique system of self-governance established by the collective bargaining contract); United Steelworkers v. Enterprise Wheel & Car Corp., 363 U.S. 593 (1960) (holding that arbitrators can give remedies even after the contract has expired, and can consider extra-contractual sources as long as the award draws its essence from the contract).

20. See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 255-57. The Court specifically confirmed the union's status as the exclusive representative of its members, its broad bargaining authority during contract negotiations, and its obligation to represent its members fairly, impartially, and in good faith. Id.

21. See Barrentine v. Arkansas-Best Freight Sys., Inc., 450 U.S. 728, 749-50 (1981); Alexander v. Gardner-Denver Co., 415 U.S. 36, 58 n.19 (1974) (commenting that in light of past racially discriminatory practices by unions, no harmony of interest between the union and employees can be presumed in racial discrimination disputes); Maalik v. Int'l Union of Elevator Constructors, Local 2, 437 F.3d 650, 653-54 (7th Cir. 2006) (holding that the union was liable under Title VII for making a conscious decision to do nothing about the racially and sexually discriminatory behavior of its members with full knowledge of its power to punish the wrongdoers). In Barrentine, the Court noted:

Against a background of union discrimination, Congress was aware that, in the context of claims under the Civil Rights Act, unions sometimes had been the adversary of workers. Plainly, it would not comport with the congressional objectives behind a statute seeking to enforce civil rights protected by Title VII to allow the very forces that had practiced discrimination to contract away the right to enforce civil rights in the courts.

Barrentine, 450 U.S. at 750.
antidiscrimination policy may be advanced by arbitral resolution of discrimination disputes.

The third Part shows the incentives unions have to serve as gatekeepers of employees' statutory rights. It details how unions can evaluate and pursue legitimate claims in the same way private attorneys would. This means that unions can drop claims short of arbitration without exposing themselves to discrimination lawsuits or allegations that they breached the duty of fair representation. Further, unions can drop claims without waiving employees' substantive rights. The article concludes that the Pyett principles' success will require a reformulation of the union's role in the workplace but that the survival of unions depends on such changes. Structural changes in the economy and global wage competition have made traditional contract-based unionism bankrupt; unions must evolve and provide legal services in order to remain important to workers.

I. INTERPRETING PYETT

In 14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett, the Supreme Court ruled that unions are empowered to bargain away their members' statutory right to bring age discrimination claims in court. In exchange for employer concessions, unions can agree that all of their members' workplace claims will be resolved by arbitration exclusively. The Court added, however, that unions cannot prospectively waive their members' substantive antidiscrimination rights. This means that unions cannot make arbitration agreements that fail to provide for statutory damages, attorney fees, and discovery rights, among other things.

22. See Susan R. Hobbs, Moderation Likely to Prevail in Active Year of 2012 Collective Bargaining, 15 DAILY LAB. REP. (BNA) S-47 (Jan. 24, 2012) (discussing how foreign competition, high unemployment and a weak economy will adversely affect unions at the bargaining table); see also Charles B. Craver, The Impact of Financial Crises Upon Collective Bargaining Relationships, 56 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 465, 469-70 (1988) (observing that free trade policies have strengthened the bargaining clout of employers by allowing businesses to easily shift operations to low cost localities when faced with union demands); Cynthia L. Estlund, Economic Rationality and Union Avoidance: Misunderstanding the National Labor Relations Act, 71 TEX. L. REV. 921, 950 (1993) (noting that employers now pursue a low wage strategy in part because product market competition has increased with globalization).

23. Pyett, 556 U.S. at 257-58, 274 (holding that the bargain to arbitrate "must be honored unless the ADEA itself removes this particular class of grievances from the NLRA's broad sweep").

24. The Court concluded that "[a]s in any contractual negotiation, a union may agree to the inclusion of an arbitration provision in a collective bargaining agreement in return for other concessions from the employer. Courts generally may not interfere in this bargained-for exchange." Id. at 257.

25. See id. at 265 (confirming the Court's prior holding in Alexander v. Gardner-Denver, 415 U.S. 36, 51-52 (1974), that federal antidiscrimination rights are not susceptible of prospective waiver). The Pyett Court noted that by agreeing to arbitrate, an employee only gives up his right to seek relief in court, and retains all substantive rights conferred by statute. See id. at 265-66.

26. See id. at 273 ("[A] substantive waiver of federally protected civil rights will not be upheld.").
Pyett's far-reaching principles create doubt about the decision's legitimacy and viability. This is complicated by Pyett's political backdrop of a conservative Court majority that adopted the views of employers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, while rejecting those of unions and the neutral National Academy of Arbitrators. Further, Pyett toppled employment discrimination laws from their pedestal by holding that such laws are no different than other workplace terms that unions and employers have traditionally traded. And, by holding that the broad benefits of unionism outweigh specific losses of individual liberty, the decision appears to brush aside the fact that labor law grants unions the power to sacrifice employees' antidiscrimination rights in pursuit of self-interest or the interest of the collective.

For many Court-watchers, the decision's failure to account for the differences between contract labor arbitration and statutory employment arbitration threatens workplace protections afforded to employees and sows confusion. The general discontent with Pyett has triggered legislative

27. See Brief for Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America as Amici Curiae Supporting Petitioners, 14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett, 556 U.S. 247 (2009) (No. 07-581), 2008 U.S. S. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 440, at *6-8 (arguing that employees give up no substantive right when their union agrees to arbitrate their claims, no conflict of interest can be presumed between the worker's individual interests and the union's collective goals, and the duty of fair representation is available to protect employees from union misconduct); see also Brief Amicus Curiae of the National Academy of Arbitrators in Support of Respondents, Pyett, 556 U.S. 247 (No. 07-581), 2008 U.S. S. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 587, at *21-31 (arguing that it is too dangerous to give unions control of their members' judicial forum rights subject only to the duty of fair representation, harmony of interest between employees and unions cannot be presumed, and that wide union discretion to process claims under current law allows unions to sacrifice their members' substantive rights). Even union amici argued that unions should not be given the power to control their members' judicial forum rights because of the inherent conflict between the two groups and the ineffective oversight provided by the duty of fair representation. See, e.g., Brief of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and Change to Win as Amici Curiae in Support of Respondents, Pyett, 556 U.S. 247 (No. 07-581), 2008 U.S. S. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 621, at *5-6, 18-23; Amicus Curiae Brief of National Employment Lawyers Association et al. as in Support of Respondents, Pyett 556 U.S. 247 (No. 07-581), 2008 U.S. S. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 620, at *46-53 (arguing that unions have a conflict of interest problem in waiver situations that cannot be cured by the duty of fair representation).

28. See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 256 ("The decision to fashion a [CBA] to require arbitration of employment-discrimination claims is no different from the many other decisions made by parties in designing grievance machinery."). Justice Souter had great difficulty accepting this assessment of the status of statutory civil rights, particularly in light of Court precedents holding that antidiscrimination rights are special. See id. at 281-82 (Souter, J., dissenting).

29. See id. at 271 (stating that Congress decided "that the benefits of organized labor outweigh the sacrifice of individual liberty" and any conflict of interest argument is a meritless collateral attack on the NLRA).

30. See Kenneth M. Casebeer, Supreme Court Without a Clue: 14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett and the System of Collective Action and Collective Bargaining Established by the National Labor Relations Act, 65 U. MIAMI L. REV. 1063, 1064 (2011) (contending that the Court confused individual rights and collective rights when deciding the Pyett case); Margaret L. Moses, The Pretext of Textualism: Disregarding Stare Decisis in 14 Penn Plaza v. Pyett, 14 LEWIS & CLARK L. REV. 825, 843, 849, 851 (2010) (arguing that there is no statutory or common law support for the holding in Pyett, and the decision will create tremendous problems that can only be resolved by litigation); J. Nicholas Haynes,
proposals to undo it. In the judicial branch, judges have limited the impact of the decision by limiting the union’s ability to drop a grievance short of arbitration, construing it as a prohibited waiver of employees’ substantive rights. Further complicating matters is another judicial theory where unions may drop claims, but then union members are presumptively entitled to independently pursue them.

Despite the decision’s unpopularity, its transformative potential cannot be denied because it portends a precedent-setting unification of labor and employment law. Read broadly, Pyett holds that when unions contract for forum waivers, their members are bound to arbitrate their discrimination claims even if their union does not want to participate in the case. In effect, as long as the arbitration clause delivers a forum with substantive rights intact, with or without the union, employees will be deemed capable of effectively vindicating their statutory rights. This is a remarkable turnaround from the Court’s position in 1974 that unions were not empowered to bargain away their members’ statutory individual rights.

On Precarious Ground: Binding Arbitration Clauses, Collective Bargaining Agreements, and Waiver of Statutory Workplace Discrimination Claims Post-Pyett, 2011 J. Disp. Resol. 225, 225, 238 (2011) (arguing that the Pyett decision has created a great deal of confusion because it left many questions unanswered and transformed a forum designed to address contractual disputes into an arena where employee rights may be satisfied by unions and employers). But see David L. Gregory & Edward McNamara, Mandatory Labor Arbitration of Statutory Claims, and the Future of Fair Employment: 14 Penn Plaza v. Pyett, 19 Cornell J.L. & Pub. Pol’y 429, 450, 457 (2010) (contending that although the Court was activist, political, and ideological in deciding Pyett, the decision does not spell doom for employees’ antidiscrimination rights because it will have limited application).


34. See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 258-59 (citing Gilmer v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp., 500 U.S. 20, 26-33 (1991)). While the Court declined to address the power of unions to drop grievances, saying that contention was pure speculation in this case, it noted that the real issue is whether the collective bargaining contract allows the union to prevent its members from vindicating their statutory rights. Id. at 273-74.

35. See id. at 258-59, 273-74.

36. See Alexander v. Gardner-Denver Co., 415 U.S. 36, 51 (1974) ("Title VII’s strictures are absolute and represent a congressional command that each employee be free from discriminatory practices. Of necessity, the rights conferred cannot form no part of the collective-bargaining process since waiver of these rights would defeat the paramount congressional purpose behind Title VII.").
A. Arbitration Law for Statutory Claims

In Pyett, the Court merged the law governing union waivers with the Gilmer rules governing individual employment waivers. Instead of carving out a unique set of principles for unions, the Court simply layered the rules for at-will employees' waivers onto the collective bargaining process. The effect is that all of the principles of employment arbitration are applicable to union waivers.


Gilmer held that absent a congressional mandate to the contrary, individual workers can agree to trade their rights to a judicial forum in return for arbitral resolution of disputes with their employers. The theoretical foundation for Gilmer is that loss of the judicial forum does not equate with loss of statutory or substantive rights. As long as the arbitration agreement permits employees to vindicate their statutory antidiscrimination rights in the arbitral forum, those laws will serve their remedial and deterrent functions. The Gilmer Court concluded that the switch to arbitration was a change in process, not a redaction of substantive protection; therefore, absent some legislative restriction, employees can agree to a forum change.

In Gilmer the Court signaled that judicial hostility to arbitral resolution of statutory discrimination claims had ended. The Court ruled that arbitrators are competent at interpreting statutory law, arbitral forums are conducive to handling statutory claims, and employees' statutory rights are

37. See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 258 ("The Gilmer Court's interpretation of the ADEA fully applies in the collective-bargaining context. Nothing in the law suggests a distinction between the status of arbitration agreements signed by an individual employee and those agreed to by a union representative.").
38. See id. at 258-59. The Court ruled that that as long as the union waiver did not cede substantive rights, it will be as valid and enforceable as waivers made in the Gilmer non-union context. See id.
39. See id.
40. Gilmer v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp., 500 U.S. 20, 26 (1991) (holding that an objecting employee needs to prove that Congress intended to preclude waiver of the judicial forum for a statutory claim by reference to the statutory text, its legislative history, or by showing an "inherent conflict" between the purposes of arbitration and the purposes of the statute). The Court then concluded that Congress never intended to preclude arbitral resolution of ADEA claims. Id. at 29.
41. See id. at 26.
42. Id. at 28.
43. Id. at 26-28.
44. See id. at 24-25 (citing the FAA and Court precedents as evincing a liberal policy in support of arbitration).
protected in arbitration.\textsuperscript{45} Citing to the Court’s approval of arbitration agreements in the commercial contract and securities contexts, the Court announced that it would now favor arbitration agreements in the employment context.\textsuperscript{46}

Evidence suggests that the contractual powers conferred on employers by \textit{Gilmer} permit employers to erect obstacles to employees’ vindication of their statutory rights. For example, based on the \textit{Gilmer} principles, employers do not need employees’ express consent to subject them to arbitration,\textsuperscript{47} nor do they need to provide consideration or something of legal value to bind employees to their arbitration policies.\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Gilmer} also allows employers to unilaterally implement dispute resolution systems that provide employees with fewer rights than what is expressed in statutory law.\textsuperscript{49} By definition, employees lose their right to a jury, appellate review, and public development of the law when they become involuntarily bound to an employer’s decision to implement an arbitration policy. And some employers have gone further and drafted mandatory arbitration policies that severely restrict or eliminate employees’ statute of limitations rights, discovery rights, damages entitlements, and attorney fee entitlements, among other things.\textsuperscript{50} Such restrictive policies directly rob employees of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{45} See id. at 30-32 (rejecting concerns about arbitral bias, limits on discovery, and the absence of opinions and publicity as “far out of step” with the Court’s sentiments that the arbitral forum is suitable for resolving statutory disputes).
\item \textsuperscript{47} See Richardson v. V.I. Port Auth., No. 2009-136, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 40787, at *32-33 (D.V.I. Apr. 21, 2010) (“In the wake of \textit{Gilmer}, numerous courts have extended its holding to find that a broadly worded arbitration clause governs disputes beyond those involving the terms of the contract, including discrimination claims.”).
\item \textsuperscript{48} See Sprinkle v. Gen. Dynamics Land Sys., No. C09-16722, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 43157, at *8-10, 26 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 30, 2010) (holding that illusory promise of at-will employment is sufficient consideration for an employee’s promise to waive his judicial forum); Pennington v. Northrop Grumman Space & Mission Sys. Corp., 269 F. App’x 812, 819 (10th Cir. 2008) (holding that an employer’s reciprocal agreement to arbitrate can constitute consideration so long as the employer does not have the unilateral power to “terminate or modify the arbitration agreement once the employee’s claim has accrued”).
\item \textsuperscript{49} For example, employers are not required to include in their arbitration policies the precise statute of limitations, discovery rights, damages provisions or attorney fees and forum costs provisions of the respective antidiscrimination statutes. See Farber v. Menard, Inc., 367 F.3d 1048, 1053-55 (8th Cir. 2004) (upholding an arbitration agreement that required the employee to pay all of his attorney’s fees and half of the arbitrator’s fee). As long as an illegal arbitration policy can be modified or reformed by the court or arbitrator to permit vindication of statutory rights, it may be upheld. See Ragone v. Atlantic Video, 595 F.3d 115, 123-24 (2d Cir. 2010); Jackson v. Cintas Corp., 425 F.3d 1313-17 (11th Cir. 2005); Parilla v. IAP Worldwide Servs. V1, Inc., 368 F.3d 269, 287-88 (3d Cir. 2004).
\item \textsuperscript{50} See Nino v. Jewelry Exchange, Inc., 609 F.3d 191, 197 (3d Cir. 2010) (invoking an arbitration policy that gave the employee only five days to complain); McDaniels v. Hospice of Napa Valley, No. C06-2558 CW, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 52752, at *5 (N.D. Cal. July 19, 2006) (invoking an arbitration policy that prohibited discovery prior to the hearing); Plaskett v. Bechtel Int’l Inc., 243 F.
substantive rights or may materially limit employees' ability to vindicate their discrimination rights in arbitration.

*Gilmer*, in effect, provided a platform from which to view how employers may manage their Court-created prerogative to require at-will employees to relinquish their judicial forum as a condition of employment. But although *Gilmer* expanded employers' common law prerogative to impose arbitration policies, it did not endorse overreaching. To the extent that employer policies unduly limit employees' ability to prosecute their claims or recover what is guaranteed by statute, courts have generally found them to be unconscionable. *Gilmer* therefore stands for the proposition that employees forced to arbitrate must get both the opportunity to advance their case and the recovery options that would otherwise be available to them in court. Anything less would be a prospective or substantive waiver.

*Gilmer*'s broadening of the employer's common law prerogative to contract away workers' antidiscrimination forum has demonstrated workers' vulnerability because of the potential for abuse. The prospect of employers overreaching in their arbitration policies has highlighted the need for employee-protective protocols in a labor market that continues to struggle with discriminatory practices. It is therefore instinctive to view with suspicion the Court's decision to adopt the *Gilmer* principles for union waivers. While Court critics were still fretting about the abuses that *Gilmer* Supp. 2d 334, 340-41 (D.V.I. 2003) (involving an arbitration agreement that required each party to pay its attorney fees regardless of the outcome of the case); Derrickson v. Circuit City Stores, Inc., No. DKC 95-3296, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21100, at *14 (D. Md. Mar. 19, 1999) (involving an arbitration provision that capped punitive damages and limited back pay to one year); Armendariz v. Found. Health Psychcare Servs. Inc., 6 P.3d 669, 675, 682-83 (Cal. 2000) (involving an arbitration policy that excluded punitive damages and limited any compensatory damages award); Fitz v. NCR Corp., 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 88, 91-92 (Cal. Ct. App. 2004) (involving an arbitration policy that limited discovery to two depositions).

51. See *Hall* v. Treasure Bay V.I. Corp., 371 F. App’x 311, 312-13 (3d Cir. 2010) (holding that an arbitration agreement that required a low-wage employee to pay the entire cost of arbitration should she lose was unconscionable).

52. See *Hooters* v. Phillips, 173 F.3d 933, 938 (4th Cir. 1999) (holding that an arbitration agreement that authorized the company to pick the entire panel of arbitrators from which three will be selected was “crafted to ensure a biased decision-maker”).

53. *Gilmer* implicitly rejected arbitration policies that impeded the congressional goals of antidiscrimination law by requiring that such policies not deter or limit employees’ ability to vindicate their statutory claims. See *Gilmer* v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp., 500 U.S. 20, 28 (1991).

54. See supra notes 51-52.

55. See supra notes 51-52.

56. An example of such a protocol was provided by the Dunlop Commission. *See U.S. COMM’N ON THE FUTURE OF WORKER-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS, THE DUNLOP COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF WORKER-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—FINAL REPORT 56-57 (1994).* The Dunlop Commission suggested that, in order to be fair, private arbitration systems to resolve statutory disputes need to include (1) a qualified neutral arbitrator, (2) a fair and simple discovery method, (3) a fair cost sharing system, (4) a right to independent representation, (5) remedies equal to those available in litigation, (6) a reasoned written opinion, and (7) limited judicial review to ensure compliance with the law. *Id.*
countenances, the Court expanded its waiver theory in Pyett to also give unions the prerogative to control their members’ dispute resolution forum.

2. Labor Arbitration: The Pyett Rules

Observers have voiced concern that the Pyett decision is simply forcing statutory claims into a system that was designed for contract disputes. But Pyett could be read differently. The decision can be interpreted as confirming the traditional principles of labor arbitration and supplementing them with the Gilmer principles for statutory cases.

In Pyett, the Court concluded that grievance arbitration is a mandatory subject of bargaining. The Court, however, did not address whether a union and its members are bound to honor a unilaterally implemented arbitration policy that is the product of a bargaining impasse. This is a particularly interesting question because arbitration policies generally require the parties’ consent in order to be binding. Yet, when a topic is a subject of mandatory bargaining, the employer can unilaterally implement its last good faith proposal upon reaching impasse. After Pyett, this would mean that employers can always implement forum waiver policies, if not through consensus agreements with unions, then involuntarily after bargaining to impasse. Once implemented, the mandatory arbitration policy becomes a “contract term” even though the union did not expressly consent to it. While this may seem problematic, on the other hand, because

57. See Haynes, supra note 30.
59. Under prevailing labor laws, employers are free to unilaterally implement their pre-impasse proposals and break the impasse after deadlocking on mandatory subjects. See LEE MODJESKA, ABIGAIL COOLEY MODJESKA & ZACHARY L. KARMEN, FED. LAB. LAW: NLRB PRAc. § 9:9 (2012); see also W. Newspaper Publ’g Co., 269 N.L.R.B. 355, 355 (1984) (“it is well settled that, after bargaining to an impasse, an employer does not violate Section 8(a)(5) of the [NLRA] by making unilateral changes, as long as the changes are reasonably encompassed by the employer’s pre-impasse proposals.”), supplemented by 276 N.L.R.B. 1566.
60. See Gateway Coal Co. v. United Mine Workers, 414 U.S. 368, 374 (1974) (“No obligation to arbitrate a labor dispute arises solely by operation of law. The law compels a party to submit his grievance to arbitration only if he has contracted to do so.”). But the principle of actual consent is not absolute. In John Wiley & Sons Inc. v. Livingston, 376 U.S. 543, 548 (1964), the Court ruled that national labor policy may require a successor employer to arbitrate grievances under a collective bargaining contract it had not consented to. See also Nolde Bros., Inc. v. Local 358, Bakery and Confectionary Workers Union, 430 U.S. 243, 255 (1977) (holding that the duty to arbitrate may survive contract expiration); Litton Fin. Printing Div. v. NLRB, 501 U.S. 190, 209 (1991) (narrowing the scope of arbitrable rights that survive contract expiration to “vested” rights).
61. See Atrium of Princeton, LLC v. NLRB, 684 F.3d 1310, 1317 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (citing Mail Contractors v. NLRB, 514 F.3d 27, 31-32 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (noting that when a union and employer are at a bargaining impasse, “[t]he employer then may make unilateral changes that are reasonably comprehended within [its] preimpasse proposals”).
62. See NLRB v. McClatchy Newspapers, Inc., 964 F.2d 1153, 1164-66 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (holding that an employer may be able to hold out to an impasse over mandatory subjects of bargaining, even over proposals which would give it discretion over mandatory subjects).
of the mandatory subject classification, an employer could not circumvent the union and make side agreements directly with union members about arbitrating statutory claims.  

The Pyett decision confirmed that the union is the employees' exclusive representative that will make decisions about mandatory subjects of bargaining, including its members' wages, hours and other working conditions.  

It then broadened the union's bargaining authority by holding that the union's contractual powers extend to its members' statutory forum rights.  

Further, the Court reaffirmed the obligation of unions to represent their members fairly, impartially and in good faith.  

By affirming the traditional principles of labor arbitration, the Pyett rules permit a relatively painless transition to arbitrating statutory claims.

In addition to leaving the law of labor arbitration intact, the Court decided that the principles of Gilmer also govern the behavior of unions.  

Some may see this as unworkable because under traditional labor laws, unions have wide discretion in deciding whether to bring claims, or whether to drop claims they have brought prior to arbitration.  

By contrast, in personal waiver cases, the employee is guaranteed the arbitral forum, and has total control over the decision whether to advance his case.  

Further, in personal waiver cases, the employee can presume that his representative or

---

63. See Mendez v. Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide, Inc., 346 F. App’x 602, 603 (2d Cir. 2009) (holding that employer side-deals for arbitration are unenforceable because this is a mandatory bargaining subject over which unions have exclusive authority). The Supreme Court confirmed this conclusion in Pyett, 556 U.S. at 255-56.

64. See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 255-56.

65. See id. at 256-57.

66. Id. at 256.

67. See id. at 255-57. The Court specifically confirmed the union’s status as the exclusive representative of its members, its broad bargaining authority during contract negotiations, and its obligation to represent its members fairly, impartially, and in good faith. Id.

68. See id. at 258 (holding that the Gilmer principles are equally applicable to collective bargaining situations).


Congress did not intend judicial review of a union’s performance to permit the court to substitute its own view of the proper bargain for that reached by the union. Rather, Congress envisioned the relationship between courts and labor unions as similar to that between the court and the legislature. Any substantive examination of a union’s performance, therefore, must be highly deferential, recognizing the wide latitude the negotiators need for the effective performance of their bargaining responsibilities.

Id.

70. See infra text accompanying notes 84-94; see also Mark Berger, A Step Too Far: Pyett and the Compelled Arbitration of Statutory Claims Under Union Controlled Labor Contract Procedures, 60 Syracuse L. Rev. 55, 80-81, 83, 86-89 (2009) (noting that for organized workers, their unions control whether and how an issue is arbitrated while individual workers control the decision to proceed in arbitration if they are not represented by a union).
lawyer will make decisions based on the merits of his case. A union member, however, cannot always be sure that his union is relying on legitimate claim-related considerations when making advocacy decisions. Unionized workers may face the prospect of hostility from their representative emanating from discriminatory animus or antagonistic group interests. This could result in no case being filed or a decision to perfunctorily prosecute or drop the discrimination claim.

The Pyett Court's failure to effectively address the historical and inherent tension between individual rights and union interests has left doubts about the viability of union waivers. However, the prospect of union abuse could be controlled if Pyett is understood to hold that, in order to be valid, union waivers must deliver the employee into the arbitral forum with substantive rights intact. This means that the union waiver provision must permit the employee his day before the arbitrator, even if the union drops the case because it harbors discriminatory animus or determines that the employee's case is weak or frivolous. This is the *quid pro quo*: if the union and employer want to trade employees' judicial forum, then the arbitration agreement must also permit the employee to proceed in front of an arbitrator if the union declines to represent him.

---

71. See Chauffeurs, Teamsters & Helpers, Local No. 391 v. Terry, 494 U.S. 558, 585-86 (1990) (explaining that while a union may consider collective interests when representing an individual, a private lawyer's ethical duties preclude representation when self-interest or other conflicts exist); see also MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.7(a)(1)(2).

72. See Berger, supra note 70, at 83-84.

73. See Blue v. Int'l Blvd. of Electrical Workers, Local 159, 726 F. Supp. 2d 1009, 1011-15 (W.D. Wis. 2010) (involving a union business manager who refused to refer-out black electrician for work on racial grounds and then retaliated against the union secretary when she questioned his motivation); Slaughter v. Fred Weber, Inc., 570 F. Supp. 2d 1054, 1056 (S.D. Ill. 2008) (involving a union that denied black females the opportunity to sign work referral sheets and referred them for temporary and short-term jobs while referring white males to full-time and permanent positions).

74. See Maalik v. Int'l Union of Elevator Constructors, Local 2, 437 F.3d 650 (7th Cir. 2006) (involving a union that refused to help a black female employee when senior white employees refused to give her on-the-job training because of her race and gender).

75. This relaxation of the union's power is necessary to address the concerns the Court raised in 1974 in *Alexander v. Gardner-Denver*, 415 U.S. 36, 58 n.19 (1974). There, the Court confronted the issue of the manner and extent to which the grievance is presented in view of the unions' power to subordinate individual rights in pursuit of collective interests, and in light of unions' past discriminatory practices against racial minorities. Id. An arbitration policy that guarantees the employee his day before the arbitrator takes away the union's power to drop the case for improper reasons.

76. See id. (expressing concern that the collective interest of the union will discriminatorily overpower that of the individual employee). As the exclusive representative, the union can decide for legitimate administrative reasons that it does not want to advocate. See Emporium Capwell Co. v. W. Addition Cmty. Org., 420 U.S. 50, 69-70 (1975) (holding that union members do not have separate negotiation rights); NLRB v. Allis-Chalmers, 388 U.S. 175, 180 (1967) (noting that, by prioritizing collective bargaining, Congress chose to subordinate the rights of union members to the discretion of their chosen representative). While under extant labor laws unions and employers generally do not permit employees to go it alone or to advocate with private counsel, this is the price the parties must pay if they wish to trade employees' statutory forum rights. See Joseph B. Ryan, *The Encouragement of Labor-Management Cooperation: Improving American Productivity Through Revision of the National
accomplished by contract, and Pyett should be read to require these conditions as a prerequisite to a union waiver's legitimacy.77

This approach departs from current labor laws, which generally do not dictate the content of labor contract provisions, and lodge the discretion to file grievances and advocate in arbitration solely in the hands of union officials, subject to the duty of fair representation.78 This modification to bargaining discretion is also binding on employers79 and is narrowly limited to instances when the parties desire to arbitrate statutory claims. The Pyett modification of a union's authority to drop claims is a limited one that is restricted to instances when the union is contractually required to represent employees in discrimination cases.80 In all other instances, the union's power to control the filing or blocking of grievances remains intact, and there are no amendments to extant labor laws.81

B. Lower Courts' Post-Pyett Responses

Interpreting Pyett as requiring arbitration agreements that guarantee union members the arbitral forum will bring clarity to judicial disagreement over the power of unions to control their members' substantive rights. The Court did not specifically address whether a union's decision to drop a case

Labor Relations Act, 40 UCLA L. REV. 571, 628 (1992) (noting that many unions view employee direct-dealing with employers as undermining the union's role).

77. Although the Court avoided the contention that the union's blocking power constituted a substantive waiver, it referenced respondents' argument that if the employees were permitted by contract to go it alone, they would not be prevented from vindicating their statutory rights. See 14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett, 556 U.S. 247, 273-74 (2009).

78. See Vaca v. Sipes, 386 U.S. 171, 191 (1967) (holding that union employees do not have an absolute right to arbitrate their grievances). Unions also have the discretion to deny their members private counsel for claims they are pursuing or claims they dropped. See Morris v. United Parcel Serv., No. 98CIV7353KMWRLE, 2001 WL 705852, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. June 13, 2001) ("[T]here is no right for an individual grievant to be represented by his own counsel at any stage of the grievance procedure, including arbitration"); see also Castelli v. Douglas Aircraft Co., 752 F.2d 1480, 1483 (9th Cir. 1985); Bynog v. SL Green Realty Corp., No. 05 Civ. 0305 (WHP), 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19110, at *36-37 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 20, 2007).

79. In Emporium Capwell Co., 420 U.S. at 989, the Court ruled that employers are not required to deal directly with unionized employees about their grievances. This freedom to deal exclusively with the union extends to instances when the union releases the employee to use a private lawyer. See, e.g., General Drivers Local 984 v. Malone & Hyde, Inc., 23 F.3d 1039, 1043 (6th Cir. 1994); see also Payne v. Local Lodge 698, 856 F.Supp.2d 915, 923 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 6, 2012) (reaffirming that principles of collective bargaining and the NLRA are violated when an employer disregards a union chosen by its workers, and negotiates with them directly). Pyett seems to modify this general rule in the context of statutory claims.

80. While unions are not required to take all contractual claims to arbitration, see Vaca, 386 U.S. at 191, they must deliver employees with statutory claims to the arbitral forum. Cf. Shankle v. B-G Maintenance Management of Colorado, Inc., 163 F.3d 1230, 1234-35 (10th Cir. 1999) ("[A]n arbitration agreement [involving a non-union employee] that prohibits use of the judicial forum as a means of resolving statutory claims must also provide for an effective and accessible alternative forum.").

81. See Vaca, 386 U.S. at 191.
or its power to block arbitration also constitutes a substantive waiver since such actions may deny the employee a forum to vindicate his rights. Some courts have theorized that the blocking power of unions does not extend to antidiscrimination rights. In Gildea v. Building Management, the collective bargaining contract contained an arbitration provision that effectively waived the employee's court forum rights. The grievance procedure also provided that only the union could choose to bring claims or compromise or settle them. When the union did not file a discrimination case for the employee, the plaintiff-employee argued that this constituted a substantive waiver that released him to pursue his case in court.

However, the district court disagreed, holding that the employee failed to prove that the contract prevented him from effectively vindicating his statutory rights. To prove that the forum waiver contract prevents vindication, the employee must show alternatively that the contract imposed high arbitration costs, improperly shortened the statute of limitations for filing a claim, provided for a wrongful award of attorneys' fees, or otherwise robbed the employee of a statutory right. The employee here was unable to show that any of these statutory rights were vitiated, in part because the contract provided that the arbitrator must apply the appropriate law. On the question of the union's refusal or failure to arbitrate, the court found that the contract did not require union participation at arbitration.

82. For a definition of this term, see notes 25-26 and accompanying text.
83. See 14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett, 556 U.S. 247, 273-74 (2009). The Court concluded that it could not resolve this issue because it involved disputed factual questions that were not briefed or properly presented to the Court. Id. This hesitation is interesting in view of the Court’s willingness to take on issues not presented in other cases. For example, in Patterson v. McLean Credit Union, a Section 1981 employment discrimination case, the Court ordered the parties to brief and argue the legitimacy of Runyon v. McCrary, which held that Section 1981 prohibits racial discrimination in the making and enforcement of private contracts, even though that issue was not before the Court. Patterson v. McLean Credit Union, 491 U.S. 164, 171-72 (1989) (discussing Runyon v. McCrary, 427 U.S. 160 (1976) superseded by statute on other grounds, Pub. L. No. 102-166, 105 Stat. 1071. See also Watson v. Fort Worth Bank and Trust, 487 U.S. 977, 982, 994-98 (1988), a decision in which the Court articulated more stringent proof responsibilities for plaintiffs in disparate impact cases, although the issue before the Court was whether disparate impact analysis as articulated in Griggs v. Duke Power Co., 401 U.S. 424 (1971), was applicable to subjective employer decision making.
85. See id. at *13-14. The contract provided that the right to bring claims was vested in the union exclusively, and individual employees could not bring claims, or compromise or settle them without the union's written permission. Id.
86. See id. at *5. The employee argued that this scenario is an exception to the Pyett principle that union waivers are binding. Id.
87. See id. at *12-13, 16 ("No party has put forth evidence showing that the CBA prevents Plaintiff from effectively vindicating his statutory rights through arbitration as an individual.").
88. See id. at *11.
89. Id. at *16.
90. See id. at *16.
Although the contract provided that only the union can bring or settle claims, the court found that the contract was silent on whether a claim could proceed if the union dropped it, therefore the possibility existed that the employee could proceed without the union.91

In addition to finding that a contractual provision that gave the union exclusive control of discrimination claims did not "foreclose the possibility" of the employee going it alone, the Gildea court found that the union's blocking power only extended to contract rights, not to statutory individual claims.92 The court reasoned that statutory rights are independent of contract rights, which the union controls. Therefore, as long as the company was willing to proceed to arbitration with the employee and without the union, the waiver provision was effective.93 Since the employer had invoked the arbitration process, the employee failed to show that the contract prevented him from effectively vindicating his statutory rights in arbitration.94 In effect, the court held that the union's exclusive control of contract grievance arbitration did not extend to statutory claims.

The Gildea court's theory that a union's control of its members' statutory rights is limited to contracting away their court forum and does not extend to the prosecution of their claims has no precedent. Labor laws vest unions with exclusive control of their members' "prosecutorial" rights, even in the context of discrimination claims, subject only to a duty of fair representation.95 And labor laws do not require employers to deal directly with employees whose claims are poorly processed, dropped or blocked by

91. See id. at *13.
92. See id. at *15-16.
93. See id. at *15. The court ruled that "allowing an individual employee to pursue or to settle his statutory discrimination claim through arbitration without Union participation is wholly consistent with forbidding an individual employee from settling a union claim for breach of the CBA." Id. at *16.
94. Id. at *16.
95. This proposition is a longstanding precedent of the Supreme Court. See Emporium Capwell Co. v. W. Addition Cmty. Org., 420 U.S. 50 (1975). In this case, black employees complained to their union that the company was engaging in race discrimination contrary to Title VII and a contractual promise of nondiscrimination. Id. at 53-55. Believing that the contract's grievance procedure was ill-suited for resolving systemic discrimination, some employees attempted to meet directly with the company's president who refused to deal with them. Id. at 54-55. The employees then resorted to picketing the store and were fired. See id. at 55-56. The Court ruled that the employees had no right to circumvent the union, and the company had no obligation to deal with the employees directly. Id. at 69-70. The Court decided that the national policy against discrimination did not trump the exclusivity principle of the NLRA, which requires that employees deal only with the majority representative. Id. at 66-70. Minority group union members can therefore advance their grievances only through their union representatives who must represent them in good faith. See id. at 64, 69-70; see also Davis-Molina v. Port Auth. of N.Y. & N.J., No. 08 CV 7584 (GBD), 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93868, at *51-52 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2011) (noting that the duty of fair representation does not even require the union to file a grievance, and a union could make a tactical decision to settle a complaint without invoking the grievance process); Meeks v. HMS Host, No. 11-1021 CW, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129305, at *13-14 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2011) (noting that multiple mistakes by the union during an arbitration proceeding would not constitute breach of the duty of fair representation).
their union. Unions can relinquish their exclusive control of the grievance arbitration machinery by negotiating contract provisions that permit employees to pursue their claims directly with the employer. Without such a provision, employees are in the words of Justice Douglas, "prisoners of the [u]nion." The Pyett Court confirmed this while expanding the power of unions to contract about statutory rights.

Having a forum is indispensable for vindicating employee rights and for avoiding a prospective waiver; yet, Pyett did not hold that unions must arbitrate every discrimination claim their members make. Statutory law guarantees each employee a forum in which to pursue his claim, which is then subjected to judicial review for merit. At the same time, neither Pyett nor extant labor laws require the union to represent employees in the arbitral forum in every case. However, should the union fail to conduct a good-faith review of a claim, decide to drop a meritorious case, or refuse to file a claim for some prohibited reason, the union may face liability for breach of the duty of fair representation or for violating the NLRA or employment discrimination laws. Failures on the part of the union, however, cannot deprive the employee of the arbitral forum in a statutory case. Broadly read, Pyett requires the union to guarantee the employee the contractual right to go it alone when the union undertakes forum waiver bargaining. Anything less would make the forum waiver agreement void for preventing effective employee vindication of statutory rights.

96. See Emporium Capwell Co., 420 U.S. at 64-65, 69-70 (observing that employees must resort to the NLRA, the duty of fair representation, and Title VII to address malfeasance by their union, and holding that employers need only deal directly with the union regarding grievances).

97. As masters of the grievance arbitration machinery, unions may relinquish their power to control the processing of claims. See 14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett, 556 U.S. 247, 273 (2009) (noting that the union had permitted the employees to arbitrate individually after it had dropped their claims). However, releasing control of grievance processing is not something that unions did in the past, nor is it something unions have any incentive to do. See Emporium Capwell Co., 420 U.S. at 73 (Douglas, J., dissenting).

98. See Emporium Capwell Co., 420 U.S. at 73 (Douglas, J., dissenting).

99. See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 255-56, 273 (noting that unions are exclusive representatives of their members with broad contracting authority).

100. See Cole v. Burns Int'l Sec. Servs., 105 F.3d 1465, 1468 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (noting that public law confers both substantive rights and a reasonable right of access to a neutral forum to vindicate such rights).

While the Gildea court held that unions have no power over their members' statutory rights, other courts have held that unions have complete control. In Kravar v. Triangle Services Inc., the union dropped the employee's disability, national origin, and retaliation grievances prior to arbitration.\textsuperscript{102} The contract did not permit Ms. Kravar to bring her claims as an individual, so the court confronted the issue of whether the contract operated as a substantive waiver.\textsuperscript{103} The court answered in the affirmative on the premise that the contract denied the employee the two available forums for vindicating her statutory rights.\textsuperscript{104} With no forum to advance her claims, the court decided there was a prospective waiver.\textsuperscript{105}

In Kravar the employer argued that the union's actions were irrelevant because it was willing to arbitrate directly with the employee.\textsuperscript{106} However, the court was unwilling to permit post hoc modifications of the contract's grievance arbitration rules that made the arbitral forum available after the union dropped the claims.\textsuperscript{107} This approach contrasts sharply with that of the Gildea judge who ruled that unless prohibited by contract, the union and employer can make gap-filling or supplemental agreements which guarantee the employee the arbitral forum after the case is dropped by the union.\textsuperscript{108}

The Kravar court also did not articulate any limits on the union's power to control the statutory claims once it was incorporated into the collective bargaining contract. As such the union controlled not only the content of the forum provisions, i.e., which claims will be funneled to arbitration, but also whether and how to prosecute statutory claims. This holding is consistent with current labor laws, which give unions exclusive control of the grievance arbitration process.\textsuperscript{109}

In sum, Pyett should not be read as authorizing unions to control access to the arbitral forum, thereby creating the prospect of substantive waivers. Instead, for unions and employers desiring arbitral resolution, Pyett now modifies their bargaining powers to require a guaranteed arbitral forum with

\textsuperscript{103} See id. at *3-4. The contract provided that only the union or the company can demand arbitration. Id. at 4.
\textsuperscript{104} See id. at *9. The court found that "[t]he CBA here operated to preclude Ms. Kravar from raising her disability-discrimination claims in any forum." Id.
\textsuperscript{105} See id.
\textsuperscript{106} See id. at *9.
\textsuperscript{107} See id. at *9-11. The court ruled that "[t]he arbitration provision that the court must enforce is the one the union and the realty board entered into, not a hypothetical agreement in which the employer's consent is critical." Id.
\textsuperscript{108} See Gildea v. Bldg. Mgmt., No. 10 Civ. 3347 (DAB), 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93662, at *13-16 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 16, 2011) (holding that the employee can arbitrate individually with the employer's consent if the union drops the claim).
\textsuperscript{109} See Berger, supra note 70.
all substantive rights. *Pyett* simply informs the parties that they have the
right to bargain about arbitrating statutory claims and establishes the ground
rules for such bargaining. If the union and employer want the benefits of
forum trading, they must guarantee employees a forum to vindicate their
rights and ensure that their substantive rights are preserved. This can be
accomplished with a contract provision that provides the opportunity to
prosecute the claim and get statutory relief, with or without the union.

II.

THE VIABILITY OF *PYETT'S* PRINCIPLES

A. The Mandatory Subject Dilemma

Unions have not viewed *Pyett* as a positive development and are not
rushing to sign forum waiver agreements, limiting the revolutionary
potential of *Pyett*. But the express consent of unions may not be required
because the Court classified this issue as a mandatory subject of
bargaining. The default rules for mandatory subjects, in the event
bargaining fails, favor employers. Since the Court did not modify the rules
for mandatory subjects, this means that forum waivers will be governed
by the controlling law for mandatory subjects of bargaining. Generally, when
the parties fail to agree in first contract or contractual renewal situations, the
employer will have the power to unilaterally implement its final arbitration
proposal.

But longstanding precedents also hold that arbitration is a creature of
contract, and only consenting parties are bound to an arbitration policy. Unions may argue that for this mandatory subject employers need the
union's consent because the content of the arbitration policy compromises
workers' NLRA rights. Specifically, a mandatory arbitration policy may
preclude employees from resorting to the NLRB when disputes with their

110. 14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett, 556 U.S. 247, 256 (2009). Mandatory subjects are issues the
parties must talk about if raised because they qualify as wages, hours or terms or conditions of
employment as contemplated by the NLRA. See NLRB v. Wooster Div. of Borg-Warner Corp., 356
U.S. 342, 348 (1958). For a list of factors to consider when evaluating whether a bargaining demand is
mandatory, see Fiberboard Paper Products Corp. v. NLRB, 379 U.S. 203, 210-12 (1964).

111. See United Paperworkers v. Champion Int'l, 81 F.3d 798, 802 (8th Cir. 1996) (holding that
upon reaching impasse, an employer may unilaterally change terms and conditions of employment
provided the changes are consistent with offers the union rejected); see also Borden, Inc. v. NLRB, 19
F.3d 502, 512 (10th Cir. 1994) (holding that an employer is legally entitled to implement all or part of its
final offer with respect to mandatory subjects, upon bargaining to impasse).

112. See Rent-A-Center, W., Inc. v. Jackson, 130 S. Ct. 2772, 2776 (2010); First Options of Chi. v.
overruled on other grounds by Boys Markets, Inc. v. Retail Clerks Union, Local 770, 398 U.S. 235
(1970). Switching forums not only requires consent, but must be clear and unmistakable in the case of
agreements to arbitrate statutory claims. See Wright v. Universal Maritime Serv. Corp., 525 U.S. 70, 80
employers occur. But an exclusive arbitration policy cannot rob the NLRB of jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{113} Extant labor laws treat policies lawfully implemented at impasse as the prerogative of employers.\textsuperscript{114} For example, if a union and an employer bargain to impasse over a drug testing policy, the employer can unilaterally implement and enforce that policy against employees.\textsuperscript{115} Despite this unilateralism, the union remains obliged to represent its members if they are disciplined under such a unilaterally implemented policy subject to its duty of fair representation.\textsuperscript{116} The effect of unilateralism would be no different than in situations where the union consents to the exclusive arbitration policy without waiving its members' NLRA rights.

\textit{Pyett} can be read as endorsing the same rules for unilaterally implemented forum waiver policies. And the \textit{Gilmer} principles that \textit{Pyett} incorporated also support this conclusion. Under \textit{Gilmer}, an employee's express assent to a forum waiver policy is not necessary.\textsuperscript{117} Assent can be secured through any common law contractual rule that provides for indirect assent. So employees may accept by silence,\textsuperscript{118} or by failing to act, or by doing a particular act.\textsuperscript{119} For example, continuing to work after being

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The NLRB has held that a mandatory arbitration policy is unlawful if it limits an employee's right to access the Board's processes and benefit from the protections of the NLRA. See Supply Techs. LLC, 359 N.L.R.B. 38, at *1 (Dec. 14, 2012). This holding is supported by the Supreme Court's \textit{Waffle House} decision. See EEOC v. Waffle House, 534 U.S. 279 (2002). In \textit{Waffle House}, the Court addressed the specific question of whether an exclusive arbitration policy can limit the remedial powers of the EEOC. \textit{Id.} at 282. The Court held that a mandatory arbitration policy cannot bind a non-party agency charged with enforcing a statute, and that the pro-arbitration policies of the Federal Arbitration Act do not require the agency to give up its statutory authority. \textit{Id.} at 294.
\item See Emhart Indus., Hartford Div. v. NLRB, 907 F.2d 372, 377 (2d Cir. 1990) (stating that upon bargaining to impasse, an employer can implement some or all of its pre-impasse proposals, provided its actions were "reasonably comprehended" within its earlier offers to the union); see also NLRB v. Powell Electric Mfg. Co., 906 F.2d 1007, 1011 (5th Cir. 1990).
\item See United Steelworkers v. ASARCO, Inc., 970 F.2d 1448, 1452-53 (5th Cir. 1992).
\item See Gilmer v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp., 500 U.S. 20, 26 (1991); see supra note 40.
\item See, e.g., Seawright v. Am. Gen. Fin. Servs., Inc., 507 F.3d 967, 972-73 (6th Cir. 2007) (holding that an employee is bound to an arbitration agreement by continuing to work after its effective date); McClendon v. Sherwin-Williams, Inc., 70 F. Supp. 2d 940, 943 (E.D. Ark. 1999) (continuing to work after receiving handbook with arbitration policy binds employee); Okocha v. Hosp. Corp. of Am.,
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
informed of the forum waiver policy may be sufficient assent to form a unilateral contract. When these principles are extrapolated to unionized workers, the default would be indirect assent grounded in the employer's lawful managerial prerogatives at impasse.

By giving employers the legal prerogative to implement forum waiver policies after bargaining to impasse, Pyett makes statutory forum waiver possible any time an employer wants it. This interpretation is also consistent with the Court's pronouncement that the Gilmer principles are equally applicable to unionized workers. It therefore makes sense for unions to bargain for the best possible concessions that are available for giving up this valuable employee right. But the interests of unions and that of their members do not always align on the issue of discrimination.

B. The Tension Between Individual Rights and Collective Interests

The dispute in Pyett demonstrates the tension between individual rights and collective interests. In Pyett, the union consented to the employer contracting out work, which resulted in the demotion of some employees. The employees argued that their work was outsourced because they were old and this constituted age discrimination. The union grieved the age claim but dropped it prior to arbitration. Because the union was the exclusive representative and controlled which claims would be advanced, the employees were left without a representative or forum to make their age claim. Such a response by the union is arguably tantamount to a prohibited waiver of the employees' substantive rights. In effect, the employees were left guessing about if and how they may proceed with their age claim.

The availability of the arbitral forum should not be left as an unanswered question in the arbitration agreement between the union and employer. Antidiscrimination law requires that employees be provided an opportunity to vindicate their statutory rights. Anything short of this


121. Id. at 253.
122. Id. The union could not make a good faith allegation of discrimination to an arbitrator because it had consented to the reassignments presumably for legitimate reasons unrelated to their age. See id.
123. See id. at 253-55. But the Court decided that even though the union bowed out prior to arbitration, it was mere speculation that the forum was lost. According to the Court, the real issue in such a case is whether the contract bars the employees from the arbitral forum. Id. at 273-74.
124. Prior to the Pyett decision, the law was generally settled that union members could not prosecute or advance their grievances on their own. See Emporium Capwell Co. v. W. Addition Cmty. Org., 420 U.S. 50, 69-70 (holding that union members do not have independent bargaining rights).
125. See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 273 ("[A] substantive waiver of federally protected civil rights will not be upheld . . . .")
would be an illegal deprivation of rights conferred by statute. Employment discrimination laws set the parameters for claims. Some claims will not be meritorious or require a full trial; however, antidiscrimination law guarantees a forum for the claimant. The key to vindication is the availability of a forum in which to prosecute the claim. The employee may proceed pro se, through his union representative or with counsel. But without a forum, vindication is not possible.

Any discretion to drop the claim prior to arbitration should be vested in the employee exclusively. The Court in Pyett noted that although the union dropped the discrimination grievances prior to arbitration, it permitted the employees to go it alone, and presumably the employer was willing to arbitrate directly with the workers. But this answer is not sufficient because the employer is not legally required to arbitrate employee claims that a union has dropped. Some courts say that such post hoc modifications to the forum waiver agreement are permissible. Yet, not all judges agree.

Arbitration contracts have to be interpreted and enforced as written. In Kravar, the judge said that the only agreement that binds the employee to the arbitral forum is the one originally made in the collective bargaining contract. Arguably, because the union and employer control bargaining about this issue, then it is their prerogative to modify the arbitration provision to comply with the obligation to provide the forum without the union. If the union and employer cannot agree to a modification guaranteeing the forum, then employees are left without a forum, and the waiver agreement is illegal. The prospect of having their forum waiver deal invalidated militates in favor of contractually guaranteeing the arbitral forum ab initio.

The next issue is the union’s prosecution of the claim. As long as unions carefully consider the merits of the employee’s claim and make a good faith attempt at resolution, they should be free to drop it short of

126. See id. Although the default forum is court, the court determined that non-judicial remedies are appropriate as long as Congress did not preclude them. Id. at 258.
127. See id. at 247-48 (chronicling employees’ steps to bring their age discrimination claims after union had withdrawn them).
128. See id. at 273-74.
129. See Emporium Capwell Co., 420 U.S. at 69-70 (holding that an employer may have “strong and legitimate objections to bargaining on several fronts” over the issue of employment discrimination).
132. See id.
133. See supra note 80.
Unions cannot be required to arbitrate every discrimination claim, no more than the EEOC or private counsel can be required to prosecute every case. This is not an attribute of vindication. Unions can therefore satisfy their representation obligations without taking every case to arbitration or facing unfair representation lawsuits. Once the union declines to pursue a claim after properly evaluating its merits, the employee must be released to find private counsel or proceed pro se. Unlike contract disputes, the union cannot deny employees the opportunity to appear before an arbitrator, even if it assesses the claim as frivolous, because that is their non-waivable statutory right. But while private or pro se advocacy is the employee’s legal right, sanctions remain a real concern if the case is not prosecuted properly. The prospect of sanctions will therefore affect the union’s, the employee’s, or the private counsel’s decision whether to undertake advocacy. An employee is not entitled to a

---

134. See Vaca v. Sipes, 386 U.S. 171, 191 (1967) (holding that unions have a duty of good faith when processing grievances, and this prohibits unions from ignoring meritorious claims or processing them in a perfunctory way).

135. See id. The duty of fair representation was formulated with the unions’ financial resources in mind. The Court granted unions broad discretion to drop some claims in order to avoid the financial oppression of processing all grievances through arbitration. See also Jones v. Omnitrans, 125 Cal. App. 4th 273, 282-83 (Cal. Ct. App. 2004) (noting that in order for collective bargaining to be effective, unions need discretion in determining which grievances to arbitrate).

136. See Judiciary Act of 1789, 28 U.S.C. § 1654 (2012) (“[P]arties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel . . . .”). Plaintiffs in employment discrimination cases have utilized this option with little success in an attempt to vindicate their rights. See, e.g., Campbell v. United States, 375 F. App’x 254 (3d Cir. 2010) (sex discrimination case in which employer got summary judgment); Roberts v. Napolitano, 792 F. Supp. 2d 67 (D.D.C. 2011) (sex discrimination case lost at summary judgment); Jowers v. Family Dollar Stores, No. 09 Civ. 2620 (WHP), 2010 WL 3528978 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 16, 2010) (race claim lost at summary judgment); Harris v. Root, No. 1:08CV803, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 58316 (M.D.N.C. June 11, 2010) (race discrimination case in which employer was granted summary judgment); Cornell v. Potter, No. 8:09-cv-1171-T-30TBM, 2010 WL 1997772 (M.D. Fla. May 19, 2010) (disability and retaliation case dismissed for lack of jurisdiction). However, there is some sentiment to the contrary. The magistrate judge in the Gildea case concluded that employees should not get a “free pass” to go to court after their union had properly evaluated their cases and decided to drop them because they lack merit. See Gildea v. Bldg. Mgmt., No. 1:10-cv-03347-DAB -MHD, Doc. No. 32, at *35 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 16, 2011) (Bloomberg). The judge concluded that if an exception to Pyett existed to guarantee employees a forum irrespective of the merits of their cases, “this rule would have the perverse result of making frivolous claims easier to bring in federal court than meritorious claims, which the union would be more likely to pursue in arbitration.” Id. As support for this conclusion, the judge relied on a long line of precedents that permit unions to drop meritless claims. See id. at *29-36. The flaw with this reasoning, however, is that nearly all of the precedents cited by the judge dealt with the union’s power to drop contract claims, not statutory ones. See id. Unlike contract disputes, employees must be afforded a forum when they assert statutory rights, even when those assertions are frivolous.

representative as an attribute of vindication when the claim is not meritorious.138

By reading Pyett as requiring the union to deliver the arbitral forum in the waiver agreement, employees are protected from poor or bad faith evaluations or claim-dropping prior to arbitration. If the union does not believe that the employee’s claim has merit and drops it, the forum waiver agreement will permit the employee to proceed pro se or with private counsel, and a claim for the breach of the duty of fair representation is available if the union’s decision was not made in good faith. This formulation allows unions to waive their member’s judicial forum and deliver bias-free representation without significant additional costs.

C. The Ability of Unions to Advance Discrimination Claims

The historic and continuing problem of union leadership engaging in or condoning discriminatory practices presents another important challenge to realizing Pyett’s potential. Even as unions struggled for legal recognition and judicial non-interference in labor disputes at the turn of the 20th century, they simultaneously excluded and oppressed black workers.139 Racially discriminatory practices continued after unions were empowered by the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to be the exclusive representative when chosen by a majority of workers.140 Unions’ use of their bargaining powers to subordinate black workers remains a concern today.141

Even after Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was passed to prohibit discriminatory union practices, unions continued to reject the equal treatment mandates of the law.142 Opposition to fair treatment was not limited to union leadership but extended to the general membership.143 Unions also supported seniority systems that made blacks “new employees”

138. See Harris v. Chem. Leaman Tank Lines, Inc., 437 F.2d 167, 171 (5th Cir. 1971) (noting that unions can sift through grievances and drop or settle the ones they deem frivolous or without merit).


140. See Steele v. Louisville & N.R. Co., 323 U.S. 192, 194-97 (1944) (detailing how the union used its power as exclusive bargaining agent to rob black workers of their jobs, promotions, and other employment opportunities).

141. See Complaint at 9, Smith v. Consol. City of Jacksonville, No. 3:12-CV-345-J-32MCR, 2013 WL 1296247 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 30, 2013) (No. 3:12cv00491). The EEOC alleged that the union supported an employer exam requirement with the knowledge that it harmed the promotion opportunities of black firefighters. Id.

142. See, e.g., Local 28 of Sheet Metal Workers Int’l Ass’n v. EEOC, 478 U.S. 421, 426-31 (1986) (documenting a more than two decades-old legal battle a union waged against the antidiscrimination principle in order to insulate its own discriminatory practices).

143. See, e.g., Local 23, Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters v. Cleveland, 478 U.S. 501, 509 (1986) (noting that the union membership voted down a consent decree intended to remedy discrimination against black and hispanic firefighters, even though the union participated in settlement negotiations and got substantial concessions from the parties).
when they were finally allowed to transfer into desirable "white jobs" although this system permanently locked senior black workers behind recently hired whites.144 Furthermore, unions opposed the Department of Labor's efforts to require government contractors to set goals and timetables to correct historic exclusion of minorities and women from their labor force.145

Charges filed with the EEOC against unions offer a glimpse at the continuing tension between unions and their members in this regard. Between 1999 and 2011, 10,789 charges were filed.146 This ranged from a low of 572 charges in 2002 to a high of 1,917 charges in 2003.147 Race discrimination continues to be the leading complaint against unions, although in some years, age complaints exceeded those of race.148 The conflict between unions and the employees they represent is not limited to race and age issues. Statistics from the EEOC show that employees alleging discrimination on the basis of sex, national origin, religion, color and disability also filed complaints.149

This disharmony of interests takes many forms that may prevent employees from vindicating statutory rights when the union is the exclusive representative. For example, if a union is antagonistic to a particular protected group, it may treat members of that group in a way prohibited by law. This occurred in Maalik v. International Union of Elevator Constructors, where the court found that the union "was at best indifferent and at worst complicit" in allowing senior union members to deny a co-worker on-the-job training because of her race.150 The denial of training prevented a pay increase award, and union officials falsely told Ms. Maalik that there was nothing they could do although they knew they could fine and expel the discriminating members.151

A disparity of interests can also be seen in the way unions react to and process discrimination complaints. For example, in Morris v. Temco Service Industries, an employee repeatedly apprised her union

145. See id. at 327.
147. Id.
148. Id. In 2005, race claims comprised more than half of all claims filed against unions at 51.3%. Id.
149. See id. Sex discrimination claims averaged about 19.8% per year, and disability claims averaged about 20.4% per year. Id.
150. 437 F.3d 650, 652, 654 (7th Cir. 2006).
151. See id. at 653 ("Local 2 may not have abetted the mechanics' discriminatory refusal to train Maalik, but it made a conscious decision to do nothing, thus allowing the discriminators to prevail.").
representative that she believed her termination was the result of her complaints to the union and the EEOC about racially discriminatory treatment. The union did not investigate these complaints. The employee repeated her claims of discrimination to the union’s lawyer, who was preparing her case for arbitration, and also provided a list of witnesses to corroborate her claim. The union’s lawyer ignored all claims or evidence of discrimination, and pursued the case on a theory that the employer lacked “just cause.” However, counsel for the union permitted the employee to testify about discriminatory conduct on the job.

The arbitrator ruled for the company, noting that the union was not claiming discrimination, and the employee’s perception of a hostile work environment could not be credited. When the employee contended that the union prevented the arbitration of her discrimination claims, the union turned on her and argued, among other things, that she withdrew her discrimination claims, did not ask union counsel to arbitrate them, and failed to provide corroborating evidence of discrimination.

The court rejected the union’s position, finding it to be both incredible and implausible. The court found that despite repeated attempts to get the union to focus on discrimination, the union abandoned those claims by failing to investigate or speak to the witnesses it was provided. Other similar lawsuits against unions demonstrate continuing discriminatory behavior by union members and union officials that can impede the union’s ability to evaluate discrimination claims fairly or advocate for its members effectively.

152. No. 09 Civ. 6194 (WHP), 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84885, at *3-5 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 12, 2010). The employee, Morris, initially grieved, claiming that her supervisor and another employee were treating her discriminatorily. Id. at *3-4. About a month and a half later, with nothing done by the union, she filed a charge with the EEOC. Id. at *4. Two days after the charge was filed, she was terminated for insubordination. Id. Additionally, see Garcia v. Frank, 09 Civ. 4599(BSJ) 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 142619, at *4-5 (S.D.N.Y. July 28, 2010), where an employee claimed his union did not make discrimination allegations in his grievance despite three requests to do so.

153. Morris, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84885, at *4-5. The union representative, Foti, only spoke to the company which denied any allegation of discrimination. Id.

154. Id. at *7.

155. Id.

156. Id. at *8.

157. Id.

158. Id. at *5-7.

159. Id. at *8-9.

160. Id. at *13.

Equally telling is the prevalence of retaliation charges filed against unions. On average, 24 percent of all claims filed against unions between 1999 and 2011 were for retaliation. This translated into 2,199 complaints in thirteen years and 169 per year. The sheer number of EEOC complaints reveals the continuing mistrust union members have towards the union leadership.

Court filings alleging retaliation further depict how unions continue to struggle with the national policy of equal workplace treatment for their members. In *Blue v. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers*, the local union’s business manager subjected Susan Blue, a secretary and administrative assistant, to repeated discipline, reduced job responsibilities and isolation, because she spoke up for a black electrician who was denied work while white workers were being signed up and referred out. Similarly, in *Booth v. Pasco County*, the court found that the union retaliated against two of its members for filing race, national origin and religion claims with the EEOC against the union. The court agreed with the two employees who alleged that a memo the union sent out after the charges were filed “constituted a call for reprisal; specifically, that it was intended to (and did) spur others, namely union members, to take concrete, discriminatory actions towards them in order to punish them for filing charges of discrimination.”

These continuing lapses by unions support a concern that the interest of unions and that of their members are not always aligned. The prospect of wrongful sacrifice of statutory protection remains real, both in the context of evaluating and advocating discrimination claims. Further, confidence cannot be placed in the duty of fair representation because union abuses have continued in the face of this doctrine. Employees, therefore, need protection of their statutory rights in the waiver contract itself so that the decision to advocate and the quality of advocacy is not left solely to union officials who must grapple with the competing demands of their members.

---


163. See id.


166. Id. at 1176.

167. The duty of fair representation is a light duty placed on unions to ensure that they do not ignore their members’ grievances or process them in a perfunctory way. See *Vaca v. Sipes*, 386 U.S. 171, 190-91 (1967) (holding that unions cannot process grievances in a manner that is arbitrary, discriminatory or in bad faith). And a union does not breach this duty even if it acts negligently. See *United Steelworkers v. Rawson*, 495 U.S. 362, 372-73 (1990).
Another critique of Pyett is that the decision forces legal disputes on neutrals who are only familiar with contract interpretation matters. In reality, however, this is a non-issue. As the Court noted, arbitrators have long been handling complex commercial matters, and there is no reason why they could not be effective handling statutory discrimination cases. Further, the informality of the arbitration process allows the parties to simplify and expedite the case, and this should not be viewed as a defect when compared to lengthier court procedures. In fact, arbitrators have garnered a substantial body of experience handling antidiscrimination claims over the last twenty years.

Since the Gilmer decision, employers have increasingly adopted forum waiver provisions for statutory disputes, and a substantial number of cases have been arbitrated under those policies. Those cases show that arbitrators are familiar with the statutory mandates, the proof responsibilities of the parties, and the remedial requirements of the law. A review of awards reveals that arbitrators are working with antidiscrimination statutes in much the same way as judges, and that they

---


169. 14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett, 556 U.S. 247, 269 (2009) (noting that an arbitrator’s capacity to resolve complex legal and factual issues extends with equal force to the discrimination arena); see also Gregory & McNamara, supra note 30, at 451 (“Even assuming there ever was any legitimate basis to fear that prominent labor arbitrators notoriously lacked sufficient expertise in employment discrimination law, these concerns are simply not well-founded today.”).

170. See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 269. The Court noted that the informality of arbitration is one of its chief advantages because the parties trade the formality of court procedures for informality, simplicity and speed of arbitration. Id.; see also Allied-Bruce Terminix Cos. v. Dobson, 513 U.S. 265, 280 (1995) (“The advantages of arbitration are many: it is usually cheaper and faster than litigation; it can have simpler procedural and evidentiary rules; . . . it is often more flexible in regard to scheduling of times and places of hearings and discovery devices . . . .”) (citing H.R. REP. No. 97-542, at 13 (1982)).


172. See Caley v. Gulfstream Aerospace Corp., 428 F.3d. 1359, 1367 (11th Cir. 2005) (“[C]ompulsory arbitration agreements are now common in the workplace, and it is not an unlawful employment practice for an employer to require an employee to arbitrate, rather than litigate, rights under various federal statutes, including employment-discrimination statutes.”); see also Alexander J. S. Colvin, An Empirical Study of Employment Arbitration: Case Outcomes and Processes, 8 J. EMPIRICAL LEGAL STUD. 1, 2 (2011) (noting a dramatic increase in employment arbitration since Gilmer).

are guided by the national goal of deterrence and compensation when deciding cases.\textsuperscript{174}

\textit{E. The Demand on Union Resources}

\textit{Pyett} requires that unions do more when faced with forum waiver proposals or statutory discrimination grievances. Specifically, unions must create a process that ensures union members will be able to vindicate their statutory rights. This means that a specific procedure for processing statutory claims must be established. For instance, the short statute of limitations for contract disputes, which is often a few days or weeks, will not suffice.\textsuperscript{175} The absence of discovery, which characterizes contract dispute arbitration, will also fail due process requirements for statutory claims.\textsuperscript{176} While employees are not guaranteed the extensive procedural rules available in federal court, the \textit{Gilmer} Court held that arbitral procedures must be sufficient to allow employees "a fair opportunity to present their claims."\textsuperscript{177}

Further, unlike contract disputes, statutory claims are purely legal matters for which unions will have to hire and pay lawyers to do the advocacy.\textsuperscript{178} As opposed to contract disputes, statutory claims require more

\textsuperscript{174} See Moar, \textit{supra} note 171 (noting arbitral fidelity to effective statutory interpretation); see also W. Mark C. Weidemaier, \textit{Judging-Lite: How Arbitrators Use and Create Precedent}, 90 N.C. L. REV. 1091, 1140 (2012) (concluding that the similarity between arbitral awards and judicial opinions is striking).

\textsuperscript{175} See \textit{Grievance Procedures}, 9 COLLECTIVE BARGAINING NEGOTIATIONS & CONT. 2101, 2105-06 (1976-82) (noting that most contracts provide a time limitation of three to sixty days for the filing of grievances); see, e.g., Nino v. Jewelry Exchange, Inc., 609 F.3d 191, 202 (3d Cir. 2010) (holding that a five-day statute of limitations for a statutory claim is unconscionable); Plaskett v. Bechtel International, 243 F. Supp. 2d 334, 341-42 (D.V.I. 2003) (holding that a thirty-day notice of claim requirement is unconscionable).

\textsuperscript{176} See \textit{Fitz v. NCR Corp.}, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 88, 96-100 (Ct. App. 2004) (holding that the employer’s limitation on discovery to two depositions is unconscionable).

\textsuperscript{177} See \textit{Gilmer v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp.}, 500 U.S. 20, 31 (1999). Lower courts have adopted some minimum requirements to protect against employee loss of their substantive rights. \textit{See}, e.g., Cole v. Burns Int’l Sec. Servs., 105 F.3d 1465, 1482 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (requiring that mandatory arbitration policies provide for neutral arbitrators, more than minimal discovery, written awards, all types of relief that would be available in court, and that unreasonable costs or fees and expenses of arbitrators are not imposed as a forum access condition); see also Armendariz v. Found. Health Psychare Servs., Inc., 6 P.3d 669, 681-89 (Cal. 2000) (adopting the Cole requirements). \textit{But see Toledoano v. O’Connor}, 501 F. Supp. 2d 127, 148 (D.D.C. 2007) (questioning the validity of a per se rule that would relieve all employees of the obligation to split the fees of the arbitrator with the employer). These new protocols essentially reject the \textit{Gardner-Denver} Court’s conclusion that due process protocols, which are necessary to ensure that employees may vindicate their statutory rights in the arbitral forum, “would tend to make arbitration a procedurally complex, expensive, and time-consuming process.” Alexander v. Gardner-Denver Co., 415 U.S. 36, 58-59 (1974).

\textsuperscript{178} Historically, unions have relied on non-lawyer union officials to do most of the advocacy in labor contract arbitrations. Apparently, no jurisdiction has declared such non-lawyer representation in contract disputes to be the unauthorized practice of law. \textit{See} Joan C. Rogers, \textit{Nonlawyers Still May Represent Unions In Labor Arbitrations In Rhode Island}, DAILY LAB. REP. (BNA), Feb. 24, 2012,
careful investigation and evaluation. These costs associated with forum waivers can be viewed as disincentives for unions that benefit from significant administrative flexibility when processing contract claims. But statutory claims implicate not only the parties themselves, but also the national policy of non-discrimination and therefore cannot be equated with contract disputes such as the wrongful denial of overtime work or discipline for tardiness. The inclusion of a lawyer provides an additional check on arbitrary decision making by union officials. This reality has to be incorporated into the parties’ cost calculations when they adopt arbitral resolution as their exclusive process. In any event, it is improbable that judicial resolution will be more efficient than an arbitral process that guarantees employees their substantive rights.

Cost concerns can be offset by the fact that a prevailing employee is entitled to attorney’s fees and costs. This means that union attorneys should get fees in cases they successfully prosecute. The fee rules also

available at http://news.bna.com. Some jurisdictions expressly permit such representation. Id. But discrimination claims are grounded in federal and state statutory schemes, not contractual promises between the parties, and this makes their advocacy the practice of law for which legal representation is required. See In re Little Compton, 37 A.3d 85, 93 (R.I. 2012) (noting that “informality, flexibility, speed, efficiency and economy” are some of the benefits that undergird the exemption for non-lawyers advocating in contract disputes, although such advocacy technically falls within the definition of law practice (citing COMMITTEE REPORT, Labor Arbitration and the Unauthorized Practice of Law, 30 RECORD OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, at 427-28 (1975))).

179. Unions have broad discretion in deciding which grievances to pursue. See Vaca v. Sipes, 386 U.S. 171, 191 (1967). They also are permitted to use non-lawyers to advocate even though their representation mimics the practice of law. See supra note 178 and accompanying text.

180. Although when unions provide lawyers to represent workers the union and not the employee is the client, the lawyer can serve as a filter for arbitrary or misguided representation by union officials. See MODEL RULES OF PROF'L CONDUCT R. 1.13 (2012). This rule provides that “[a] lawyer employed or retained by an organization represents the organization acting through its duly authorized constituents.” Id. at § (a). If union officials instruct a lawyer to drop a meritorious claim or process it in a perfunctory way, the lawyer should be able to ignore those instructions as harmful to the best interests of the union. See id. at § (b). Because such bad faith instructions expose the union to liability under the NLRA, Title VII, and Section 301 of the LMRA, the lawyer can also raise the matter with the highest authority in the organization. Id. Should the union’s top leadership fail to effectively address the matter, the lawyer is relieved of the confidentiality rules governing the lawyer-client relationship. Id. at §§ (e)(1)-(2); see also Prof’l Servs. Indus., Inc. v. Kimbrell, 758 F. Supp. 676, 683-84 (D. Ks. 1991) (noting that when the organization’s interests and that of its constituents become adverse, the lawyer must disclose that the organization is the true client and cease representation).

181. See Gilmer, 500 U.S. at 31 (finding that arbitration’s narrow procedural guarantees translate into more expeditious resolution of claims); see also William M. Howard, Arbitrating Claims of Employment Discrimination, 50 DISP. RESOL. J. 40, 45 (1995) (estimating that it costs $96,000 to litigate an employment discrimination claim versus $20,000 to arbitrate, based on a survey of management lawyers); Colvin, supra note 172, at 8 (reporting that cases in arbitration take about half the time to resolve as they would in litigation).


183. There appears to be no reported case in which a union was awarded fees in an employment discrimination arbitration. But the proposition that they should get such statutorily authorized fees seems sound. See Int’l Ass’n of Firefighters, Local 46 v. Everett, 42 P.3d 1265, 1267, 1270 (Wash. 2002) (holding that a union that successfully advocates for its members in arbitration is entitled to
expose unions to a fee penalty for bringing frivolous cases. This coerces unions to carefully evaluate cases and drop those that lack merit. In effect, unions can drop meritless or weak claims with little risk of being sued, and they can also prosecute meritorious claims without worrying about the expense of investigation and advocacy. While there will be costs associated with bringing these claims, unions should not allow this fear to prevent them from agreeing to arbitration proposals for statutory claims.

III. CONSOLIDATING UNION POWER THROUGH PYETT

Insistence on contract-based unionism ignores reality. Private-sector unionism has declined so dramatically that unions now lack the strength in numbers they once had. The NLRA was designed around the power of collective strength. Historically, by making unions the exclusive representative of large units of workers, employers were forced to take union demands seriously. If a union chose to strike because of an employer’s failure to bargain in good faith, companies had to face the harsh economic consequences. With large numbers of unionized workers, the strike weapon was potent. So although employers were not required to

184. See Christiansburg Garment Co. v. EEOC, 434 U.S. 412, 422 (1978) (holding that a prevailing employer is entitled to attorney’s fees and costs if the employee’s claim is frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation); see also Bailey v. Papa John’s USA, Inc., 236 F. App’x 200, 204-05 (6th Cir. 2007) (granting fees to employer because employee’s claim lacked merit).


186. Eve I. Klein, Bruce J. Kasten & Joanna R. Varon, The Employee Free Choice Act—What’s an Employer to do?, 81 N.Y. ST. B.J. 38, 40 (Sept. 2009) (noting that “the principles of the NLRA promote the right of employers and unions to engage in good-faith collective bargaining without any artificial restraints on free-market forces”).

187. See Abner J. Mikva, The Changing Role of the Wagner Act in the American Labor Movement, 38 STAN. L. REV. 1123, 1126 (1986) (noting that the Wagner Act contemplated a massive organizing campaign that would produce industry-wide unionism that placed all employers at the same competitive disadvantage).

188. The collective action by substantially all the workers—a strike—could bring the business to a halt in the short term as well as disrupt operations for a prolonged period of time. Michael J. Zimmer, Unions & the Great Recession: Is Transnationalism the Answer?, 15 EMP. RTS. & EMP. POL’Y J. 123, 134 (2011). While unions in collective bargaining can sometimes offer “carrots” to employers to improve business, the “stick” of a strike has been effective historically at getting employers to agree to collective bargaining agreements that improved wages and other terms and conditions of employment.
capitulate to union demands for wages and benefits above market rates, they did so out of economic necessity.

Now things have changed. Unions represent only a small percentage of the private-sector labor force, and the NLRA still does not give workers any economic or contractual rights at the bargaining table. Further, the economy has shifted full gear from manufacturing to service, and trade barriers have fallen giving employers more freedom to shift capital and operations abroad. The outsourcing of work will continue to displace millions of workers, and global wage competition will continue

Id. Between 1969 and 1979, strikes involved around 950,000 workers every year, and the number of striking workers dropped to less than half a million workers every year between 1987 and 1996. Dan Clawson & Mary Ann Clawson, What Has Happened to the US Labor Movement? Union Decline and Renewal, 25 ANN. REV. OF SOC. 95, 97 (1999). More recently, the number of workers involved in strikes has declined dramatically. For example, in 2011, there were 19 major strikes and lockouts involving 1,000 or more workers and lasting at least one shift, which idled 113,000 workers in comparison to 11 major work stoppages idling 45,000 workers in 2010. News Release, U.S. DEP’T OF LABOR, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, Major Work Stoppages in 2011 (Feb. 8, 2012). In 2009, there were record lows of 5 major work stoppages idling 13,000 workers. Id.

189. See supra note 185.

190. As originally enacted in 1935, the NLRA did not address the bargaining obligations of the parties once a union was recognized. See National Labor Relations Act, Pub. L. No. 74-198, 49 Stat. 449, 452-53 (1935). In 1947, the Taft-Hartley Amendments imposed the narrow bargaining obligation to meet at reasonable times, and to bargain in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. See Labor Management Relations Act, ch. 120, sec. 101, § 8(d), 61 Stat. 136, 142-43 (1947); 29 U.S.C. § 158(d) (2012). But this provision also added that an employer need not agree to any union proposal, make any concessions, or sign a contract. See § 8(d), 61 Stat. at 142-43; 29 U.S.C. § 158(d).

191. In 1945, at the conclusion of the Second World War, the services industry accounted for 10% of nonfarm employment, compared with 38% for manufacturing. In 1982, services surpassed manufacturing as the largest employer among major industry groups. See Joseph R. Meisenheimer II, The Services Industry in the ‘Good’ Versus ‘Bad’ Jobs Debate, MONTHLY LAB. REV., Feb. 1998. By 2010, the services industry accounted for 78.8% of nonfarm employment, while manufacturing represented only 8.1% of the economy. See Richard Henderson, Industry Employment and Output Projections to 2020, MONTHLY LAB. REV., Jan. 2012.


to depress compensation for American workers. These factors have combined to make unions nearly impotent as contract-makers and contract-enforcers.

Today, it is extremely difficult for unions to consummate a first contract. And in cases of contract renewal, unions increasingly face demands for concessions by employers. Roles are reversed now, and the NLRA does not prohibit it. Employers have the luxury of high unemployment, which makes replacement workers readily available at compensation levels lower than what their collective bargaining contracts provide. Employers also have the flexibility to move their businesses to low-wage regions or countries if their demands for cutbacks are not taken

---


195. One response to the contract-making woes of unions was the Employee Free Choice Act of 2009, S. 560, 111th Cong. (2009). This proposed amendment to the NLRA included a provision which stated:

If after the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which bargaining is commenced, or such additional period as the parties may agree upon, the parties have failed to reach an agreement, either party may notify the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service of the existence of a dispute and request mediation. Whenever such a request is received, it shall be the duty of the Service promptly to put itself in communication with the parties and to use its best efforts, by mediation and conciliation, to bring them to agreement. If after the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the request for mediation is made the Service is not able to bring the parties to agreement by conciliation, the Service shall refer the dispute to an arbitration board established in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Service. The arbitration panel shall render a decision settling the dispute and such decision shall be binding upon the parties for a period of 2 years, unless amended during such period by written consent of the parties.

196. Employers are influenced by how bargaining will affect their net profits. “In refusing a union demand or in making a concessionary demand of its own, an employer is telling the union at the bargaining table that (a) it cannot pass the cost of meeting a union’s wage demand onto a customer in the form of a price increase; (b) it cannot absorb the union’s demands as an additional operating cost; or (c) it cannot absorb or pass on costs and still maintain a desirable profit level.” Christopher T. Hexter, *Duty to Supply Information Nielsen Lithographing Co. Revisited: The Board’s Retreat from Collective Bargaining as a Rational Process Leading to Agreement*, 8 Lab. Law. 831, 844-45 (1992). Today, concession bargaining is a very common practice. For example, Verizon took this approach during its latest contract renewal negotiations. See Steven Greenhouse, 4-Year Deals for Unions at Verizon, N.Y. Times, Sept. 19, 2012, at B1, available at [http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/business/verizon-workers-reach-4-year-tentative-pacts.html?_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/business/verizon-workers-reach-4-year-tentative-pacts.html?_r=0).

197. As Michael J. Zimmer writes:

Where workers can be replaced or the work outsourced and/or offshore, the higher the level of protection of the right of freedom of association and collective bargaining by law, the greater the incentive employers have to escape unionization by using those techniques or by engaging in illegal activity that, under the National Labor Relations Act, is not of great consequence even when the law is enforced.

Zimmer, supra note 188, at 145.
seriously. Under these circumstances, the strike weapon is not a viable option.

This dramatic decline of unions’ contractual authority necessitates an expansion of the union’s role to legal disputes. Antidiscrimination rights provide one of the few checks on growing employer discretion to buy labor at competitive or efficient prices. Older workers, women, minorities, and others facing job loss or compensation cutbacks need more representation to protect dwindling workplace rights and diminishing economic security. Pyett permits unions to play a critical role in preserving these rights.

The success of the Trilogy principles flowed in part from their connection to a national policy promoting private resolution of labor disputes. By emphasizing the validity of parties’ privately struck bargains and the private process they established to resolve disputes, the Court advanced the national goal of limited judicial intervention in labor disputes. The exclusivity and finality principles of the Trilogy forced the parties to resolve their differences on a continuing basis, and without the strife or costs associated with litigation. At first blush, the Pyett decision does not seem to provide similar benefits. In practice, however, it can.

Unions are well-equipped to represent their members with antidiscrimination claims. For example, unionized employees have an experienced bargainer to negotiate their forum waiver provision. Having a union representative working in this capacity protects against employer

198. See Mikva, supra note 187, at 1131-32 (noting that the NLRA always permitted employers to use cheaper labor markets such as at-will employees to underbid unions, but the increasing availability of foreign low-wage labor has exasperated the plight of unions at the bargaining table); Virginia Doellgast, Ursula Holtgrewe & Stephen Deery, The Effects of National Institutions and Collective Bargaining Arrangements on Job Quality in Front-line Service Workplaces, 62 INDUS. & LAB. REL. REV. 489, 494 (2009) (“Outsourcing may be used to check the growth of unions and to weaken the bargaining power of workers by moving operations outside the coverage of collective agreements and ‘escaping’ traditional legal and negotiated constraints on the employment relationship.”); Janet Walsh & Stephen Deery, Refashioning Organizational Boundaries: Outsourcing Customer Service Work, 43 J. MGMT. STUD. 557, 559-60 (2006) (finding outsourcing as a common strategy used to segment call center work or to pursue a more cost-focused strategy, as it allows firms to avoid collective agreements and economize on the costs of employment benefits).


201. See United Steelworkers v. Am. Mfg. Co., 363 U.S. 564, 566-68 (1960) (holding that judges must give the contract’s grievance/arbitration provision “full play” and defer to the arbitrator’s judgment, even when they deem a claim to be frivolous).

202. See supra note 19 and accompanying text.
overreaching that has been observed in the at-will context. Unions can ensure that employees’ substantive rights are not diluted or eliminated in the forum waiver agreement. They can also ensure that procedural tricks are not used to tip the scales in favor of the employer. Such policing by the union will guarantee that the process for filing claims is fair, that substantive protections remain intact, and that the decision-maker is impartial. With respect to the “repeat player” problem, unions can provide continuity in monitoring whether arbitrators are biased in favor of employers who fund the forum by arbitrating multiple cases.

Pyett also guarantees the employee his day before the arbitrator. In comparison, an at-will employee cannot be so sure he will get his day in court. Because of the EEOC’s limited resources, most complaining employees will not get representation from this agency to pursue meritorious claims. Private attorneys are also not readily available because the prospects for success in antidiscrimination cases are very low. High burdens of proof combined with increasing judicial hostility to discrimination claims deter lawyers from taking discrimination cases. But under the Pyett rules, the employee gets to see the arbitrator, and have his case heard and decided on the merits every time. This opportunity to vindicate antidiscrimination rights greatly advances the statutory goals of deterrence and remediation.

203. See supra notes 50-52 and accompanying text.


205. Unions are very experienced in selecting arbitrators and can protect against employer attempts to construct a biased selection process. For examples of arbitration agreements in which employers attempted to construct a biased selection process, see Hooters v. Phillips, 173 F.3d 933, 938 (4th Cir. 1999). In Hooters, the employer structured the selection process to guarantee the arbitrator of its choice. Id.

206. With the rise of mandatory arbitration, there has been increased concern that sophisticated employers who appear before arbitrators on multiple occasions and therefore provide them business, gain arbitrator bias over employees who are usually one-time players. See generally, Lisa B. Bingham, Employment Arbitration: The Repeat Player Effect, 1 EMPLOYEE RTS. & EMP. POL’Y J. 189, 205-09 (1997) (providing a study that shows low employee success rates against repeat player employers and raising the prospect that arbitrator bias may have played a role). See also Nancy A. Welsh, What is “(Im)partial Enough” in a World of Embedded Neutrals, 52 ARIZ. L. REV. 395, 399-407 (2010) (discussing the repeat player concern in the broader context of all private neutrals).

207. See Nancy M. Modesitt, Reinventing the EEOC, 63 SMU L. Rev. 1237, 1241-47 (2010) (discussing the limited resources of the EEOC to process, investigate, and litigate charges of discrimination).

208. See id. at 1244, 1248.

The Pyett principles guarantee delivery of all substantive antidiscrimination rights. Arbitrators must apply the relevant statutory rules and award the appropriate statutory remedies.\(^\text{210}\) This further advances the statutory goal of equal treatment because prevailing employees will receive compensatory, and where appropriate, punitive damages provided by law when their rights are violated.\(^\text{211}\) Successful aggrieved workers can also expect an award of attorney’s fees and costs.\(^\text{212}\) And while the reviewability of the arbitral awards may be limited,\(^\text{213}\) any denial of substantive rights would make the award void as contrary to public policy.\(^\text{214}\) Because the forum waiver agreement must deliver the employee before an arbitrator who is bound by the substantive law, vindication remains a robust proposition under Pyett.

CONCLUSION

The Pyett decision requires a leap of faith in much the same way the Steelworkers Trilogy did. Read appropriately, the decision permits workers to vindicate their antidiscrimination rights through a contractual process that delivers them into the arbitral forum with their substantive rights intact. The idea of unions litigating statutory grievances as a routine matter will take some getting used to. After all, unions are weary of the added costs and exposure to liability that come with protecting their members’ legal rights.\(^\text{215}\) Some unions are also still struggling to comply with the antidiscrimination mandates they are being called upon to protect. But this change is beneficial in two key ways: it can help unions who are struggling to prove their continuing importance in the workplace, and help workers who want a remedy for their discrimination claims but face long odds in court. When unions overcome their discomfort with the Pyett principles, they can start to realize its revolutionary potential.


\(^{214}\) See Pyett, 556 U.S. at 265-66.
